The University of Chicago

A GROUP TEST FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF CRUELTY-COMPASSION: A PROPOSED MEANS OF RECOGNIZING POTENTIAL CRIMINALITY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

By
JOSEPH WYMAN HAWTHORNE

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Offprinted from
The Journal of Social Psychology
Volume III, No. 2, May, 1932

The University of Chicago

A GROUP TEST FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF CRUELTY-COMPASSION: A PROPOSED MEANS OF RECOGNIZING POTENTIAL CRIMINALITY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

By
JOSEPH WYMAN HAWTHORNE

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Offprinted from
The Journal of Social Psychology
Volume III, No. 2, May, 1932

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

Offprinted from *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 1932, **3**, 189-211.

A GROUP TEST FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF CRUELTY-COMPASSION: A PROPOSED MEANS OF RECOGNIZING POTENTIAL CRIMINALTY*[1]

From the Department of Psychology, University of Chicago

JOSEPH WYMAN HAWTHORNE

PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

It was the purpose of this study to devise a test that applied to a more restricted field than heretofore attempted in the study of criminal or delinquent tendencies and to lengthen the test in the hope of improving the reliability. It was hoped that a test could be devised which would have some predictive value so that early tendencies might be noted and treated. The field chosen was that which involved crimes against the person. Such a field seemed to be socially the most significant, and it was thought that if early tendencies toward this sort of criminal behavior could be detected in even a very small number of cases the test would be worth while.

NATURE OF THE TRAIT TESTED

Upon analysis it is readily seen that "crimes-against-the-person" is by no means a simple classification. The following is an attempt to make a classification of the mental tendencies which might predispose an individual to commit a violent crime against the person of another:

1. *Sadistic Tendencies.* Sadism is generally considered to be some form of perversion of the sexual impulse in which sexual gratification is obtained by inflicting pain. It exists in all stages from the

*Recommended by Harvey A. Carr, accepted for publication by L. L. Thurstone of the Editorial Board and received in the Editorial Office, April 27, 1931.

[1]Whatever of value may exist in this thesis is due to the patient, kindly, and keen criticisms of Professor Harvey A. Carr, whose interest and encouragement were responsible for the completion of the work. Thanks are also gratefully extended to Mr. Willis Clark of the Psychology Department of the Los Angeles city schools for ideas drawn from his "Delinquency Index Scale," to Mr. and Mrs. Z. R. DeArmond and Miss Helen Baum for the administration of a large number of the tests, and to Mr. Paul Kemske for valuable aid in clerical and statistical work.

type of individual who enjoys teasing another to the type who will not hesitate to commit murder at the slightest opportunity.

2. *Pathological Irritability.* In this type of individual an intense anger is aroused by a relatively insignificant and often unrecognizable stimulus. It is during such a state that many of the so-called justifiable homicides occur, as well as many other types of crime with vengence as a motive.

3. *Pathological Unemotionality.* A person with this trait is said to be unable to experience such feelings as grief, pity, compassion, and the like, which might tend to act as deterrents to crime. Some of the famous "thrill" murders are supposed to have been committed by persons of this type.

4. *Delusional Trends.* The individual in this classification who is apt to commit a violent crime is one who is suffering from delusions of persecution, however aroused. His crimes are committed in self-defense against some person whom he imagines has the intention to harm him. Most of the murders of public officials have been committed by people of this type.

5. *Hallucinations.* Many murders have been committed by persons whose defense was that God or an angel told them to do it. These people are undoubtedly telling the truth, and a number of murders can be accounted for on the basis of the hallucinations of insanity, drug addiction, alcohol addiction, and the like.

6. *Criminalism.* Some psychiatrists insist on a special classification of a mental disorder variously called criminalism, moral insanity, moral imbecility, or the like, which is usually listed under the constitutional psychopathic states. This type of individual seemingly is unable to acquire any ethical discriminatory ability although other functions seem normal. Whether or not such a constitutional disorder actually exists, it is at least worth listing as a possible cause of violent crimes.

7. *Mental Deficiency.* With the introduction of mental testing it was thought that mental deficiency was one of the major causes of crime. With further study this seems not to be the case. Nevertheless, there is a much greater chance of a crime being committed by a person unable to foresee the consequences of the act than by a person of greater intelligence, other things being equal. In spite of the fact that perhaps the intelligent criminal is the one who is not caught, there seems to be a much higher percentage of feebleminded among the criminal population than among normal groups. (Vari-

ously estimated as from 8-50% among criminal population and 2-3% among normal population.)

8. *Hypersuggestibility.* Whether or not there is a definite trait of suggestibility it is highly probable that Macbeth was not the only person who had been goaded into a crime by the insistence of another. Whether with or without cause, the suggestive influence of the vivid portrayal of crimes on the screen has often been commented upon.

Whatever may be the mental twist which causes an individual to attack another, it does seem that there is a general trait, usually called cruelty, which predisposes the person possessing it toward overt acts of cruelty. It would also be expected that this trait exists in varying degrees in different individuals ranging from cruelty at one extreme to compassion on the other. It was in an attempt to rate individuals on this scale of cruelty-compassion that this test was devised.

As to the question as to whether the tendencies which make for crimes of violence are native or acquired, this study is not concerned. What is insisted upon is that before the adult indulges in overt criminal behavior he must first have certain interests and attitudes which will predispose him to that behavior. The criminal sadist, for example, who as an adult commits murder, as a child in all probability enjoyed torturing animals or other children. The gangster killer is assumed to have had a different way of evaluating things as a youth than the person who studiously avoids any sort of cruelty.

Construction of the Test

In an attempt to get at these interests and attitudes the following test[2] was constructed, which is largely self-explanatory. The subject is asked to rate his preference for each of the items in each section of the test in order from one to five. There are 31 sections, each of which contains one item which *a priori* was considered to be of sadistic (in its broadest sense) import. It is assumed that the attitude of the subject toward this one significant item in relation to the others will give some indication of his reaction tendencies.

Administration of the Test

The test may be passed out to as large groups as can be conveniently handled. The subjects, who are elementary or high-school

[2]Appended to end of this paper.

students, merely read the directions and act accordingly. There is no time limit on the test, and the subjects are invited to ask about any of the items that they do not understand. It is announced as a test of student preferences, or as a game, or what-not, as long as the real purpose of the test is not revealed to the subjects. The administration is thus a simple matter as it does not require any special supervision and can be given out at odd times to school pupils who can finish part or all of the test at a sitting.

Scoring of the Test

The tests are scored by drawing a circle around the significant or key item in each of the sections, and by simply adding up the numbers which appear in the circles, the other items being disregarded. Thus, if the significant item is rated a "five" in each case the score will be 155 which, if the test means anything, means that the subject shows tendencies which are the opposite of cruel. On the other hand, if the significant items are all rated a "one" it would tend to show that the subject had a condoning attitude toward cruelty. Thus the lower the score the higher is the degree of tolerance toward acts of cruelty and supposedly the more the tendency to overt acts of cruelty. The higher the score the greater the degree of compassion or the less the tendency toward overt acts of cruelty.

Standardization of the Test

The tests were given to a group of 126 students of regular junior and senior high schools who ranged in age from 10 to 20 years. This was used as a normal or standard group. With the results obtained from the normal group were compared the results from slightly over 300 students in special schools for juvenile delinquents and from 29 patients of a state insane hospital.

Special No. 1 was a high school of a large California system whose enrollment was largely, though not entirely, made up of discipline cases from other high schools of the system.

Special No. 2 was a state school for juvenile delinquents whose enrollment was made up of cases committed by the courts.

Special No. 3 was the Chicago Cook County School for Boys where the enrollment is also made up of court cases.

Special No. 4 was the Kankakee State Hospital for the Insane.

Table 1 shows the results obtained. Column 1 shows the school, Column 2, the number of cases, Column 3 the means, Column 4

TABLE 1

	Number of cases	Mean	*P.E.* (mean)	Standard deviation	*P.E.* (sigma)
Normal	126	119.10	0.88	14.68	.62
Special No. 1	178	108.17	0.81	16.16	.58
Special No. 2	71	105.30	1.32	16.50	.93
Special No. 3	58	102.17	1.56	17.67	1.113
Special No. 4	29	119.00	2.19	17.52	1.56

the *P.E.* of the means, Column 5 the standard deviation from the mean, and Column 6 the *P.E.* of the *S.D.*

These differences were then compared to see whether or not they were statistically reliable with the results as shown in Table 2. Column 1 shows the special schools each grouped with the normal high school. Column 2 shows the means, Column 3 the *P.E.* of the means, Column 4 the differences between the means of each special school and the normal high school, and Column 5 shows the difference divided by the *P.E.* of the difference.

TABLE 2

	Mean	*P.E.* (mean)	Diff.	*P.E.* (diff.)	Diff. / *P.E.* (diff.)
Normal	119.10	.88			
Special No. 1	108.17	.81	10.93	1.19	9.18
Normal	119.10	.88			
Special No. 2	105.30	1.32	13.80	1.59	8.67
Normal	119.10	.88			
Special No. 3	102.17	1.56	16.93	1.79	9.46
Normal	119.10				
Special No. 4	119.00				

Reliability of the Test

The reliability of the test was determined, first, by correlating the first half against the second half and correcting by means of the Spearman-Brown formula, and, secondly, by correlating the odd against the even items and correcting as before. In addition to this, the tests were given twice to 21 college freshmen and the correlation between the two administrations of the test was obtained. This result is appended to the following table for what it is worth.

	N	*R*	*P.E.* (*R*)
First half *vs.* second half	261	.71	.02
Odd *vs.* even	234	.66	.02
Two administrations	21	.93	.02

Index of Reliability

The correlation between the obtained scores and their corresponding "true" scores was obtained by the formula:

$$R \text{ (obtained score)} = \sqrt{R12}$$

which in this case becomes:

$$R \text{ (obtained score)} = \sqrt{.71} = .84$$

Probable Error of Measurement

In order to obtain the probable error of any individual score the following formula was used:

$$P.E. \text{ (meas.)} = .6745\ \sigma\ \sqrt{1—R(12)}$$

which in this case becomes:

$$P.E. \text{ (meas.)} = .6745 \times 17.67 \times \sqrt{1—.71} = 6.42$$

Thus the chances are even that the score of any individual lies between 6.41 points above or below his obtained score.

Validity of the Test

A question which at once presents itself in a test of this kind is whether the subjects are reacting on the basis of some real attitude, the measure of which the test results show, or whether they are able to appreciate the object of the test and react on the basis of intelligence or perhaps mere chronological age. If this were the case it would seem (*a*) that the subjects would be able to tell what the test was designed to measure as soon as they had taken it, (*b*) that the scores would be uniformly high, and (*c*) that there would be at least a positive if not a high positive correlation between test results and intelligence and between test results and chronological age.

As a check on the first possibility practically all subjects taking the test were asked informally concerning the nature of the test. In no case was the correct diagnosis made.

As a check on the second possibility both IQ's and chronological

ages were correlated with test results as shown in the following table:

	Number of cases	*R*	*P.E.* (*R*)
IQ—test score	101	—.02	.07
Age—test score	325	—.03	.04

The really adequate method of getting at the validity of this kind of test would be to study a group of individuals taking it, and to carry the study through a period of ten or twenty years, correlating subsequent behavior with the original test results. At the present time such a procedure is, of course, impossible. In lieu of such a program, information was obtained on a group of individuals who had been admitted to special institutions to see if there were any relation between test score and such behavior as had already been observed. This information was obtained from case histories, commitment records, interviews with parents and teachers. First a group, all of whom obtained scores below the mean of the special schools, was studied in this manner. Here follows a summary of the evidence obtained.

Ev. Tu. Age 49. Test score 99. Committed to Kankakee State Hospital for wanting to kill his brother. Released and worked a year as butcher. At time of his second commitment he had a seizure in which he jumped into a pen and tried to kill a steer. While in hospital he picked up a pair of scissors and tried to attack an attendant.

Ew. Je. Age 30. Test score 105. Committed to Kankakee State Hospital after getting into a fight at the home of his sister and becoming violent with the police. Patient had persecutory delusions and believed people were going to kill him.

Ot. Ha. Age 20. Score 102. Committed to Kankakee State Hospital after becoming violent and attacking his father again and again in a fit of rage. While in hospital took picture from the wall and attacked another patient.

Pa. W. Age 23. Score 104. Started a fight in a cafe. Was arrested and sent to psychopathic and finally committed to the State Hospital.

Jo. Kl. Age 34. Score 100. Committed to Kankakee with a psychosis, but with nothing in his case history to indicate troublesome nature. Hospital records, however, shows record of treatment for slight wounds received while in fights with another patient. Was in two fights in the month previous to examination of his record.

Ha. Br. Age 18. Score 98. Committed to special school for theft. Reported as a very trying pupil in the classroom and as a bully on the playground.

Al. Da. Age 15. Score 91. Committed to special school for truancy. Described as irritable, quick-tempered, often in fights with other boys.

Be. Ep. Age 15. Score 54. Abusive, uncooperative, with spells of violence. Committed to special school for being impossible to handle in the classroom. Refuses to do ordinary school work and is interested only in cheap detective thrillers.

Ca. Hu. Age 15. Score 90. Committed to special school for continual truancy. No record of cruel behavior in school. Interview with the parents, however, brought out the fact that the subject was continually torturing the other three children all of whom were very bitter against him.

Jo. Mi. Age 16. Score 82. Committed to special school because of fighting, bullying, and constantly provoking quarrels.

Fe. Be. Age 17. Score 93. Committed for truancy. While at special was noted as a bully with the younger boys whom he tormented on the playground.

Be. Iv. Age 17. Score 103. Committed to special for being incorrigible in the classroom, tormenting all of his teachers for nó known reason.

Hu. Ca. Age 16. Score 93. Committed to special because he would get into a fight on the slightest provocation.

R. Gr. Age 13. Score 95. Described by his special school teachers as being "just naturally ornery." Continually in trouble with other boys.

Lo. Ke. Age 17. Score 96. Described as mean, troublesome, and fond of tormenting other boys.

Jo. Mc. Age 15. Score 95. Troublesome in classroom. Once stabbed another boy with a knife.

Wa. Vi. Age 16. Score 74. Bully on the school ground. Continually in fights. Other boys are afraid of him.

Li. Tr. Age 17. Score 78. Committed for general incorrigibility, fighting, meanness, and for tormenting both teachers and pupils.

Ma. Fa. Age 14. Score 105. Will not mingle with boys of his own age. Likes to bully younger boys.

Ja. Dr. Age 16. Score 86. Described by special school teachers as mean, irritable, and a bully.

Ch. Au. Age 16. Score 98. Mean, sneaky, and stubborn. Has given trouble to all of his teachers.

Em. El. Age 16. Score 99. Committed to special school for having in his possession a quantity of dynamite with which he intended to blow up his enemies.

To. Ro. Age 16. Score 86. Considered "psychopathic" by his special school teachers because of his meanness and cruelty.

Pa. Mc. Age 15. Score 103. Described by special school teachers as very mean.

El. Ba. Age 15. Score 102. Bully. Attacks other boys without any provocation.

Ep. Ca. Age 15. Score 83. Full-blooded Indian which is reason given by his special school teachers for his meanness and cruelty.

Al. Ga. Age 17. Score 89. Described as "hard-boiled" and a bully by his teachers.

Fr. Oa. Age 15. Score 89. Already considered "dangerous" by his teachers who freely predict that he will end up in serious trouble.

La. Sh. Age 16. Score 100. Intensely hates most of the other boys in the school who call him "Gopher" because of his protruding front teeth. Becomes violently angry and attacks other when teased.

Ha. Ph. Age 15. Score 90. Described as mean, irritable, and stubborn.

Ru. Tu. Age 15. Score 73. Described as mean, ornery, and continually picking fights with other boys who are smaller than he.

Al. De. Age 15. Score 103. Has periodic spells of meanness and irritability.

La. O'T. Age 15. Score 73. Known at the special school as the "Tough Irishman." Always looking for a fight and often finding it.

Ke. Ev. Age 15. Score 95. Has spells of meanness and irritability.

A group of those special-school students who made high scores was studied in the same manner. (Those normal high-school subjects making high scores of course showed no evidence of cruel traits as would be expected.) The question arises, however, as to whether the low scores might not be indicative of general criminal tendencies. Accordingly, those students from special schools who made scores above the mean of the special students were studied. Although this group has already committed such crimes as stealing, forgery, counterfeiting, and the like, there was no evidence of such tendencies toward cruelty as were exhibited in the lower group previously surveyed.

It is considered significant that the cases of cruelty were found to be in the lower group of scores. While it is true that within the scope of this study some of the lower scores failed to show any record of cruel behavior, it must be remembered that, in the first place, complete information was very often unobtainable and, in the second place, many of the subjects were too young to have had much chance to exhibit the trait.

Relative Value of the Individual Tests in the Battery

In order to determine the relative value of the individual tests in the battery a group of scores were selected at random from the upper quartile of the entire group and compared with a similar group in the lower quartile. There were 56 cases in each group. All of the upper group were from normal schools and all but six of the lower group were from special schools. The method of comparison was as follows:

1. The average performance of the 56 individuals in the low group in each of the 31 tests in the battery was determined.
2. The average performance of the 56 individuals in the high group in each of the 31 tests was determined.
3. The difference between each of the 31 means was determined.
4. For each of the 31 tests the percentage of the upper group making scores equal to or exceeding the mean of the lower group was determined.

The higher these percentages, the greater is considered the value of the individual tests.

These results are summarized in Table 3. It will be seen that in

TABLE 3

PROGNOSTIC VALUE OF SEPARATE TESTS IN THE BATTERY

Test No.	Mean score low group	Mean score high group	Difference in means	Percentage of high group above mean of low group
1	2.473	4.182	1.709	92.7
2	3.875	4.625	.750	94.6
3	3.429	4.911	1.482	98.2
4	3.161	4.446	1.285	89.3
5	3.536	4.518	.982	85.7
6	2.945	3.500	.555	85.7
7	1.673	4.268	2.595	98.2
8	3.182	4.500	1.318	85.7
9	1.945	3.964	2.019	98.2
10	3.782	4.786	1.004	94.6
11	2.509	5.000	2.491	100.0
12	2.255	3.822	1.567	83.9
13	3.125	4.857	1.732	98.2
14	3.164	4.518	1.354	85.7
15	2.232	4.357	2.125	85.7
16	1.964	3.946	1.982	91.1
17	3.482	4.709	1.227	92.7
18	2.109	4.786	2.677	98.2
19	2.818	4.473	1.655	94.5
20	1.704	4.145	2.441	90.9
21	1.685	3.643	1.958	91.1
22	1.782	3.576	1.794	92.9
23	3.236	4.643	1.407	87.5
24	2.000	3.411	1.411	98.2
25	2.000	4.393	2.393	89.3
26	2.446	3.857	1.411	78.6
27	3.679	4.911	1.232	98.2
28	3.400	4.491	1.091	89.1
29	3.564	4.566	1.002	86.8
30	3.691	4.528	.837	88.7
31	3.545	3.852	.307	74.1

TABLE 4

MEANS AND *S.D.*'s, USING ALL 31 TESTS

	No. of cases	Mean	*P.E.* (*Av.*)	Standard Deviation	*P.E.* of (sigma)
Normal	136	118.24	1.02	17.65	.721
Special No. 1	112	111.35	1.06	16.70	.75
Special No. 2	69	107.75	1.45	17.80	1.02

17 out of the 31 tests the percentages are above 90, 11 are between 85 and 90; one between 80 and 85; one between 75 and 80; and one between 70 and 75.

In order to determine whether the efficiency of the test could be improved by leaving out those tests having a low prognostic value, the data in Tables 1 and 2 were recalculated after excluding certain tests from the total. The following tables show the results obtained.

Table 4 shows the means and the standard deviations for the normal and two special schools with their probable errors and the difference between the means. In this table the total score of all 31 tests was used. (The fact that these results are slightly different from Table 2 is due to the fact that a somewhat different but nevertheless unselected group was used for this part of the study. This is due to the fact that this part of the study was undertaken later and not all of the original tests were available.)

TABLE 5

MEAN AND DIFFERENCE IN MEANS, USING ALL 31 TESTS

	Mean	*P.E.* of Mean	Diff. (Av.)	*P.E.* of (Diff.)	Diff. (Av.) / *P.E.* (Diff.)
Normal	118.24	1.02	6.89	1.47	4.68
Special No. 1	111.35	1.06			
Normal	118.24	1.02	10.49	1.77	5.91
Special No. 2	107.75	1.45			

TABLE 6

MEANS AND *S.D.*'s, LEAVING OUT TEST NO. 31

	No. of cases	Mean	*P.E.* (Av.)	Standard Deviation	*P.E.* of (sigma)
Normal	136	114.50	.989	17.10	.699
Special No. 1	112	107.70	1.05	16.65	.748
Special No. 2	69	104.01	1.37	16.90	.99

TABLE 7

MEANS AND DIFFERENCE IN MEANS, LEAVING OUT TEST NO. 31

	Mean	*P.E.* of (mean)	Diff. (Av.)	*P.E.* of (Diff.)	Diff. (Av.) / *P.E.* (Diff.)
Normal	114.5	.99	6.8	1.44	4.72
Special No. 1	107.7	1.05			
Normal	114.5	.99	10.49	1.70	6.17
Special No. 2	104.01	1.37			

TABLE 8

MEANS AND *S.D.*'S, LEAVING OUT TESTS NOS. 31 AND 26

	No. of cases	Mean	*P.E.* (Av.)	Standard deviation	*P.E.* of (sigma)
Normal	136	111.54	.96	16.75	.685
Special No. 1	112	104.50	1.03	16.20	.728
Special No. 2	69	100.68	1.335	16.45	.96

TABLE 9

MEANS AND DIFFERENCE IN MEANS, LEAVING OUT TESTS NOS. 31 AND 26

	Mean	*P.E.* of Mean	Diff. (Av.)	*P.E.* of (Diff.)	Diff. (Av.) / *P.E.* (Diff.)
Normal	111.54	.96	7.04	1.40	5.02
Special No. 1	104.50	1.03			
Normal	111.54	.96	10.86	1.64	6.62
Special No. 2	100.68	1.34			

TABLE 10

MEANS AND *S.D.*'S, LEAVING OUT TESTS NOS. 31, 26, AND 12

	No. of cases	Mean	*P.E.* (Av.)	Standard deviation	*P.E.* of (sigma)
Normal	136	108.15	.93	16.18	.66
Special No. 1	112	101.74	1.02	16.10	.72
Special No. 2	69	97.58	1.28	15.85	.91

TABLE 11

MEANS AND DIFFERENCES IN MEANS, LEAVING OUT TESTS NOS. 31, 26, AND 12

	Mean	*P.E.* of Mean	Diff. (Av.)	*P.E.* of (Diff.)	Diff. (Av.) / *P.E.* (Diff.)
Normal	108.15	.93	6.41	1.38	4.64
Special No. 1	101.74	1.02			
Normal	108.15	.93	10.57	1.58	6.69
Special No. 2	97.58	1.28			

TABLE 12

MEANS AND *S.D.*'S, LEAVING OUT TESTS NOS. 31, 26, 12, 5, 6, 8, 14, AND 15

	No. of cases	Mean	*P.E.* (Av.)	Standard deviation	*P.E.* of (sigma)
Normal	136	89.01	.81	14.10	.576
Special No. 1	112	83.09	.833	13.085	.588
Special No. 2	69	79.83	1.09	13.50	.779

TABLE 13

MEANS AND DIFFERENCE IN MEANS, LEAVING OUT TESTS NOS. 31, 26, 12, 5, 6, 8, 14, AND 15

	Mean	*P.E.* of Mean	Diff. (Av.)	*P.E.* of (Diff.)	Diff. (Av.) / *P.E.* (Diff.)
Normal	89.01	.81	5.92	1.16	5.10
Special No. 1	83.09	.83			
Normal	89.01	.81	9.18	1.36	6.75
Special No. 2	79.83	1.09			

In order to determine what effect the cutting-out of certain items of the test had on the reliability, the reliability of the test was re-computed after removal of certain tests. For this purpose one hundred unselected cases were taken from the normal high school and the first half correlated against the second half and the result corrected by the Spearman-Brown Formula. The results are shown on Table 14. Column 1 shows the numbers of the tests used in the correlation, Column 2 the correlation obtained, Column 3 the *P.E.* of *R*, and Column 4 the numbers of the tests excluded.

As a means of further checking up on the relative value of the individual tests, those tests of a similar nature were grouped together and studied from this angle. Twelve of the individual tests involve

TABLE 14

$N=100$

Number of tests used	*R*	*P.E.* (*R*)	Tests excluded
30	.80	.02	No. 31
28	.86	.02	Nos. 31, 26, 12
24	.83	.02	Nos. 31, 26, 12, 5, 6, 8, 14
22	.77	.03	Nos. 31, 26, 12, 5, 6, 8, 14, 29

TABLE 15

Percentage of upper group exceeding mean of lower group	"Watching" tests	"Owning" tests	"Judgment" tests	"Acting" tests
95-100	2	5	0	1
90-95	7	1	1	0
85-90	2	5	3	1
80-85	0	1	0	0
75-80	1	0	0	0
70-75	0	0	1	0
	12	12	5	2

the watching of some act of cruelty, 12 involve the ownership of some means of inflicting cruelty, 5 involve the judgment of acts of cruelty in others, and 2 involve the commission of overt activity.

These results are shown in Table 15. The figures in the left-hand column refer to the percentages by which the upper group, studied in Table 3, exceeds the mean of the lower group. The other figures refer to the number of the tests of the various types which fall within these percentages.

Use of Test

It is proposed that this test shall be used on children, more especially boys, of junior- and senior-high-school age. It can be given in large groups without special instruction or timing. Whether the test has any predictive value or not, it should be of value for some of the modern attempts at character education, since a subject making a score below about 110 seems from the very nature of the test to be in need of some mental readjustment. If the test does have some predictive value, and the results seem to show that it does, it is offered as a mean of recognizing the incipient gang killers and murderers of various kinds before they commit their acts.

Summary and Conclusions

1. The results seem to show that the test furnishes the possibility of rating individuals along a cruelty-compassion continuum.

2. The results seem to show that those individuals making low scores in the test are more predisposed to crimes-against-the-person than are those individuals making higher scores.

3. The test results have zero correlation with both age and intelligence.

4. Certain of the test items have greater differentiating value than others.

5. The greatest differentiating value seems to result from the exclusion of tests numbers 31, 26, 12, 5, 6, 8, 14, and 15.

6. The greatest reliability is obtained by the exclusion of tests numbers 31, 26, and 12 (R=.86; *P.E.* (r)=.02).

7. No valid conclusions could be drawn as to the comparative efficacy of test catagories: "watching," "owning," "judgment," or "acting."

8. The probable error of an individual score is 6.4 (When optimum combination of tests used, i.e., by excluding tests numbers 31, 36, and 12, the *P.E.* (*meas.*) is 3.4.)

Historical Survey of Previous Work

One of the earliest tests in this field was devised by Dr. G. C. Fernald (5) which required the subjects to rate a series of crimes in order from the least to the most serious. His norm was determined from the ratings of a group of legal and scientific men. When the test was given to delinquent and criminal groups, he found wider variations from the norm than he found in the law-abiding groups.

W. W. Clark (4) devised a battery of seven tests, each of which consisted of rating seven crimes in the order of their seriousness. He also standardized his test by obtaining ratings from a group of professional people. When it was given to delinquent subjects, he found marked deviations from the ratings of the professional group. This was known as the Whittier Scale for Grading Juvenile Offenses.

Lask (8) in Germany, using one list of crimes in much the same manner as Fernald, had individuals rank the crimes in the order of their seriousness and obtained results similar to those of Fernald.

Raubenheimer (9), as a part of a larger test, used two forms taken directly from the Whittier Rating Scale in each of which the ten crimes were rated in the order of their seriousness.

Brogan (2) used the method of rating offenses in order to study the attitude of university students toward the 16 worst practices of university people.

Thurstone (10) used the method of paired comparisons in order to study the attitude of the group toward 19 major offenses and was able to rate the seriousness of the crimes on an absolute scale. In this study, as in the study of Brogan, the objective was a measure of group

attitude toward crimes rather than a study of individual relationships.

The foregoing studies are those which use rating methods as a study of either crimes or criminality. Cady (3), Raubenheimer (9), Allport (1), Hartshorne and May (6) and Hartshorne, May, and Welty (7) have made excellent surveys on the field of personality traits as a whole.

Appendix—The Test

NAME _____ AGE _____ GRADE _____

SCHOOL _____ FATHER'S OCCUPATION _____

DATE _____ WHAT DO YOU WANT TO BE WHEN YOU ARE OUT OF SCHOOL _____

TEST I

Suppose you had a chance to witness one of the sporting events listed below. Put a "1" after the one that you would like best to see and a "5" after the one that you would care least about seeing and rate the rest accordingly.

a. A game of chess between two experts for the championship of the state. ☐
b. A game of football between two of the largest colleges of the country. ☐
c. A prize-fight between two contenders for the world's championship. ☐
d. A track meet at the Olympic Games. ☐
e. A grudge duel between two of Europe's most expert swordsmen. ☐

TEST II

Following is a list of the offenses committed by several boys of a certain high school. Put a "1" after the offense that you would condemn the least and a "5" after the one that you would condemn the most and rate the rest accordingly.

a. Took a battery out of his father's car and sold it, using the money for shows and cigarettes. ☐
b. Stole an English composition that another boy had written and handed it in for his own. ☐
c. Jabbed a five-year-old girl with his knife until she was bleeding in several places. ☐
d. Forged his mother's name to a check and cashed it. ☐
e. Persistently played hookey from school and got a job in a factory. ☐

Suppose that you were to be given your choice of one article out of each of the following groups. The value of each article in a group is the same. Assuming that you were not already supplied with any of these things,

mark with a "1" the thing in each group that you would most rather have and with a "5" the thing in each group that you care least about and rate the rest accordingly.

TEST III

a. sled
b. dagger
c. watch
d. camera
e. skates

TEST IV

a. trapeze
b. fencing set
c. ice skates
d. gold ring
e. chemistry set

TEST V

a. set of garden tools
b. stiletto
c. box of candy
d. baseball glove
e. microscope

TEST VI

a. chess set
b. sling shot
c. carton of cigarettes
d. deck of cards
e. stamp album

TEST VII

a. telescope
b. golf clubs
c. rifle
d. pen and pencil set
e. watch chain

TEST VIII

a. hatchet
b. pup tent
c. Erecto set
d. adventure books
e. electric motor

TEST IX

☐*a.* flashlight ☐
☐*b.* drawing set ☐
☐*c.* loaded dice ☐
☐*d.* hunting knife ☐
☐*e.* flute ☐

TEST X

☐*a.* rubber boots ☐
☐*b.* sweater ☐
☐*c.* black jack ☐
☐*d.* stamp album ☐
☐*e.* Eversharp pencil ☐

TEST XI

☐*a.* radio ☐
☐*b.* camping outfit ☐
☐*c.* set of story books ☐
☐*d.* revolver ☐
☐*e.* tennis racquet ☐

TEST XII

☐*a.* new hat ☐
☐*b.* cuff links ☐
☐*c.* dog ☐
☐*d.* boxing gloves ☐
☐*e.* new shoes ☐

TEST XIII

☐*a.* brass knuckles ☐
☐*b.* baseball ☐
☐*c.* whistle ☐
☐*d.* fountain pen ☐
☐*e.* brief case ☐

TEST XIV

☐*a.* pair of rabbits ☐
☐*b.* tobogganing sled ☐
☐*c.* dissecting set ☐
☐*d.* study lamp ☐
☐*e.* camping outfit

TEST XV

Suppose that through illness or for some such causes you are confined in such a manner that there is nothing whatever that you can amuse yourself with but to read and that the books listed below are the only ones available. Put a "1" after the one that you would like most to read and a "5" after the one that you would care least about, and rate the rest accordingly.

a. "Confessions of a Russian Bluebeard." A Russian criminal while awaiting execution writes in detail of how he tortured and murdered fifty-three women and children and of how he escaped capture for so many years. ☐

b. "From Forest to School-room." The story of paper, and the many and interesting processes that it goes through in coming from the forest, through the various stages until it ends in the schoolroom in the form of a book. ☐

c. "The Voyage of the Ajax." The adventures encountered by a ship on a voyage to strange parts of the world in the quest for new specimens of plant life for a large museum. ☐

d. "Pioneer Days." The story of a covered wagon caravan making the trip to California in the days of the gold rush and of a boy who afterwards became the governor of California. ☐

e. "The Life and Work of Eugene Thomas." The story of a great scientist who gave his life to a study of human disease and by his careful and painstaking work saved the lives of millions although he lost his own. ☐

In each of the following groups of sports, put a "1" after the one that you like best to watch and a "5" after the one that you care least about watching and rate the rest accordingly.

TEST XVI

a. football
b. prize-fighting
c. baseball
d. basketball
e. track

TEST XVII

a. parachute-jumping
b. horse-racing
c. ski-jumping
d. dog-fighting
e. yachting

TEST XVIII

a. sword fighting
b. surf-riding
c. gym work
d. archery
e. motor-boating

TEST XIX

a. wrestling
b. tennis
c. fencing
d. soccer
e. golf

TEST XX

a. rugby
b. cricket
c. handball
d. ice hockey
e. bull-fighting

TEST XXI

☐*a.* pool ☐
☐*b.* rifle-practice ☐
☐*c.* dancing ☐
☐*d.* ice skating ☐
☐*e.* bowling ☐

TEST XXII

☐*a.* swimming ☐
☐*b.* hunting ☐
☐*c.* hiking ☐
☐*d.* canoeing ☐
☐*e.* bicycling ☐

TEST XXIII

☐*a.* cock-fighting ☐
☐*b.* dog racing ☐
☐*c.* polo ☐
☐*d.* tobogganing ☐
☐*e.* roller skating ☐

TEST XXIV

☐*a.* horseback-riding ☐
☐*b.* chess ☐
☐*c.* dice throwing ☐
☐*d.* billiards ☐
☐*e.* revolver practice ☐

TEST XXV

Suppose that you were to be given an outing at the state capitol with special permission to attend anything that you liked, and you found all the events listed below occurring at the same hour. Mark with a "1" the

thing that you would like most to see and with a "5" the thing that you would care least about and rate the rest accordingly.

a. The legislature is to vote on whether or not that state shall refuse to abide by a recently adopted amendment to the federal constitution. ☐

b. The governor is to give out an interview to newspaper men which is of unusually great interest and which all the newspapers of the country will feature.

c. Two famous criminals are to be executed by placing them in a glass chamber and injecting poisonous gases, a new method which was violently opposed because it was said to be unnecesarily cruel. ☐

d. The secretary of state is to meet with several of the biggest business men of the country to discuss the incorporation of a new business concern that is to be the biggest firm in the country. ☐

e. The highway commissioner is to dedicate formally a link of pavement that connects both coasts in the first continuous concrete auto highway in the country. ☐

TEST XXVI

Suppose that one of the following motion picture films is to be shown at your school. Put a "1" after the one that you would like best, and a "5" after the one that you think you would least enjoy and rate the rest accordingly.

a. "The High C's." A picture showing the entire process of how violins are made from the picking and testing of the wood to the final testing for tonal qualities. ☐

b. "From Pigs to Pork." A picture showing the handling and production of meat from the farm to the table. ☐

c. "Higher Learning." A picture showing the things that a student pilot has to know in handling an airplane above the clouds. ☐

d. "The Town Cut-up." A surgeon performs several major operations before the camera showing the details of surgical technique on actual patients. ☐

e. "Hot Stuff." Modern methods of fighting fires of various kinds and an actual picture of several large fires in which the various kinds of apparatus are used. ☐

TEST XXVII

Suppose that for some reason or other you are forced to work for a packing house and that you may have the choice of the jobs listed below, all of which carry the same pay and are of equal difficulty and offer the same opportunities for advancement. Put a "1" after the one that you would like best and a "5" after the one that you would care least about having and rate the rest accordingly .

a. Feeding and caring for the live stock as it is received from the farm. ☐

b. Working a lever that plunges a knife into the heart of each animal as it comes up a runway. ☐

c. Keeping records of the loaded freight cars, keeping track of when they are shipped, where they go, and the like. ☐

d. Weighting in the stock as it is received and keeping records of weights. ☐

e. Running a machine that pastes labels on tin cans. ☐

TEST XXVIII

Below are listed some of the charges that came before a certain court one morning. Disregarding any legal consequences of these acts, mark with a "1" the one that you would the least condemn and with a "5" the one that you would the most condemn and rate the rest accordingly.

a. Held up a man at the point of a gun and forced him to give up his watch and purse containing $350. ☐

b. Keeper of an elaborate and richly furnished gambling house whose profits averaged about a thousand dollars a day. ☐

c. Attempted to organize a strike among the workers of a large factory. ☐

d. With some accomplices had assaulted and beaten into insensibility an enemy and left him bleeding on the sidewalk. ☐

e. Had been boisterously shouting and singing in a quiet neighborhood at two o'clock in the morning while in a highly intoxicated condition. ☐

TEST XXIX

Below are listed several crimes that have been committed at various times. Disregarding any legal consequences, mark with a "1" that which you condemn the least and with a "5" the one that you condemn the most and rate the rest accordingly.

a. A man in a high position in public life accepted bribes for the dispensation of government favors which resulted in a loss of millions to the government. ☐

b. A man with the help of some accomplices broke into the home of a hermit and tortured him with knives and hot irons until he died, in an attempt to make him tell where he had hidden his money. ☐

c. A contractor, furnishing materials to the government, was able, by means of short weights and inferior qualities, to defraud the government out of a million dollars. ☐

d. A politician started a malicious story about a senator which had no foundation in fact but which was so generally believed that the senator failed of re-election. ☐

e. A high government official divulged certain military secrets to a rival government and netted himself a half-million dollars in the transaction. ☐

TEST XXX

Following are some activities engaged in by some boys of high school age. Disregarding the legal consequences, mark with a "1" the activity which you would condemn the least and with a "5" the activity which you would condemn the most and rate the rest accordingly.

a. Stole a large car and drove it around until it was out of gasoline and then left it on the street. ☐

b. Set fire to a vacant house so that they could watch the fire department put out the flames. ☐

c. Threw shingle nails by the handful on a boulevard so that they could watch the discomfort of the motorists. ☐

d. Bet all the money they could on the football team of the opposing school and agreed that although they were supposed to play on their own team, they would let the other school win so that they could win their bets. ☐

e. Driving a large car on a lonely road, they collided and badly wrecked

a small car containing several people and then sped away from the scene without giving aid. ☐

TEST XXXI

Below are five of the ten commandments as given in the new American version of the Bible. Disregarding any legal consequences or anything that you have learned in church or school, put a "1" after the one that you think is the least important and a "5" after the one that you think is the most important and rate the rest accordingly.

a. Honor thy father and mother that you may live long in the land the Lord your God is giving you. ☐

b. You must not commit murder. ☐

c. You must no commit adultery. ☐

d. You must not steal. ☐

e. You must not bring false charge against your fellow. ☐

REFERENCES

1. ALLPORT, G. W. Personality and character. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1921, **18**, 441-445.
2. BROGAN, A. P. A study in statstical ethics. *Int. J. Ethics*, 1923, **33**, 119-134.
3. CADY, V. M. Psychology and pathology of personality. *J. Delinq.*, 1922, **7**, 225-248.
4. CLARK, W. W. The measurement of social attitudes. *J. Appl. Sociol.*, 1922, **10**, 13-20.
5. FERNALD, G. G. The defective delinquent class: differentiating tests. *Amer. J. Insan.*, 1912, **68**, 523-594.
6. HARTSHORNE, H., & MAY, M. A. Personality and character tests. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1926, **23**, 395-411.
7. HARTSHORNE, H., MAY, M. A., & WELTY, R. E. Personality and character tests. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1927, **24**, 418-435.
8. LASK, L. J. Ueber die Fernald'sche Methods zur Prüfung des sittlichen fühlens. *Beihefte Z. Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, No. 24. Pp. 1-84.
9. RAUBENHEIMER, A. S. An experimental study of some behavior traits of the potentially delinquent boy. *Psychol. Monog.*, 1925, **34**, No. 159. Pp. 107.
10. THURSTONE, L. L. The method of paired comparisons for social values. *J. Abn. & Soc. Psychol.*, 1926, **21**, 384-400.

Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri

UN TEST COLLECTIF DE CRUAUTÉ-COMPASSION POUR LA DÉCOUVERTE DES CRIMINELS POTENTIELS

(Résumé)

Cette étude a eu comme but la formulation d'un test qui déterminerait les tendances qui prédisposeraient un individu vers les crimes du type contre-la-personne. Bien que l'analyse rationnelle montre qu'il existe plusieurs facteurs prédisposants qui pourraient rendre un individu capable de commettre ce type de crime, tous ces facteurs semblent une partie de ce qu'on pourrait nommer un continuum cruauté-compassion. Pour trouver une mesure de la qualité de cruauté-compassion d'un sujet donné, on a formulé un test composé de trente-et-un groupes, chacun de cinq parties. On a demandé aux sujets d'évaluer chacun de ces groupes en ordre de préférence de 1 à 5. Chaque groupe contenait une partie distinctement sadiste. La somme des évaluations données à cette partie sadiste est le résultat du test. On a standardisé le test avec des sujets de la "high school" ordinaire et on a comparé les résultats avec aux des sujets des Écoles de Correction. On a obtenu des différences aussi grandes que 9 fois l'Erreur Probable de la différence. Les résultats peu élevés (indiquant des tendances cruelles) ont été comparés aux histoires des cas qui ont montré de l'évidence de comportement criminel évident dans presque tous les cas. On offre donc le test comme moyen d'évaleur les individus sur un continuum cruauté-compassion, et les résultats semblent montrer que ceux à l'extrémité cruauté de l'échelle sont plus prédisposés à commettre les crimes contre-la-personne. Il est à espérer qu'au moyen d'un tel outil on peut mettre à part les individus disposés à la cruauté et leur donner un traitement hygiénique avant qu'ils ne commettent des crimes.

HAWTHORNE

EIN GRUPPENTEST FÜR GRAUSAMKEITSMITGEFÜHL FÜR DIE ERMITTLUNG VON POTENTIELLEN VERBRECHERN

(Referat)

Es war der Zweck dieser Untersuchung, einen Test zu erfinden, der die Neigungen bestimmen könnte, die ein Individuum auf Verbrechen gegen die Person vorbereiten. Obschon die rationelle Analyse zeigt, dass es eine Reihe von vorbereitendenden Faktoren gibt, die ein Individuum befähigen könnten, Verbrechen dieser Art zu begehen, können doch alle diese Faktoren auf das zurückgeführt werden, was als kontinuierliches Grausamkeitsmitgefühl (cruelty-compassion continuum) bezeichnet werden möchte. Um die Grösse des Grausamkeitsmitgefühls irgend eines gegebenen Individuums zu messen, wurde ein Test erfunden, der aus einunddreissig Gruppen, und jede aus fünf Punkten bestand. Die Versuchspersonen wurden aufgefordert jede dieser Gruppen nach der Ordnung ihrer Wahl von 1 bis 5 zu schätzen. Jede Gruppe enthielt einen Punkt, der einen deutlichen sadistischen Einschlag hatte. Die Summe der Schätzungen, die dem sadistischen Punkt beigelegt wurden, ist der Testkoeffizient. Der Test wurde an Versuchspersonen der regulären Höheren Schulen normiert, und die Koeffizienten verglichen mit denjenigen der Versuchspersonen von Korrektionsanstalten. Es wurden Unterschiede festgestellt, die neun mal die Fehlerquelle des Unterschiedes betrugen. Niedrige Koeffizienten (die grausame Neigungen anzeigen) wurden gegen die Geschichten einzelner Fälle abgewogen, die in fast allen Fällen

schon Beweise offenkundiger verbrecherischer Haltung anzeigten. Der Test wird darum als Mittel dargeboten, um Individuen auf das kontinuierliche Grausamkeitsmitgefühl zu prüfen. Die Ergebnisse scheinen anzuzeigen, dass diejenigen, die am Grausamkeitsende der Skala stehen, mehr dazu veranlagt sind, Verbrechen gegen die Person zu verüben. Man spricht die Hoffnung aus, dass durch ein solches Mittel die grausam veranlagten Individuen abgesondert, und vor dem Begehen offener Verbrechen hygienisch behandelt werden können.

HAWTHORNE